



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,831	03/30/2001	Edward V. Gamsaragan	42390.P10234	6121

7590 09/20/2006

John P. Ward
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

WU, XIAO MIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/823,831	Applicant(s) GAMSARAGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner XIAO M. WU	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 32-49 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. (US Patent NO. 6,028,764) in view of Mital (US Patent No. 5,878,282).

As to claims 32, 39, 43, Richardson discloses a computer (see Fig. 2) comprising: a base station (12) having a processor (32, Fig. 7) and a system memory (36, Fig. 7); and a computing display subsystem (14) detachably connectable to the base station (see Fig. 2), the computing display subsystem including a display controller (80, Fig. 9), and a communication adapter (82, 84, Fig. 9) to communicate with the base station when the computing display subsystem is detached from the base station.

It is noted that Richardson does not specifically disclose the system memory is a Random Access Memory and the display subsystem including a processor. However, the Random Access Memory is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to have used different kinds of memories in a computer based upon the requirement of the computer operation. Furthermore, Mital is cited to teach a detachable display subsystem (Fig. 3) including a processor (60) and the detachable display can be independently operated from the base station. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Richardson with features of the processor for use in a detachable display as taught by Mital because the subsystem can be operated independently by using own processor even detaching from the main computer.

As to claims 33, 40, 44, Mital discloses the computing display subsystem comprising a non-volatile storage device (col. 6, line 35).

As to claims 34, 45, it is well known in the art that the non-volatile storage device can be a flash memory.

As to claims 35, 41, 46, 48, 55, Richardson discloses the processor of the computing display subsystem is operable to operate at a higher frequency power mode when connected to the base station (e.g. when the display connected to the base, the display power is drawn from the AC power source in the base 12, col. 3, lines 24-30) and at a lower frequency power mode (e.g. using battery power) when detached from the base station.

As to claims 36, 47, it would have been obvious to use the processor of the computing display subsystem is operable to operate using Intel Speedstep Technology because it was known in the art.

As to claims 37, 42, 49, Richardson discloses that the display could be a touch screen and Mital further discloses that the display is LCD display. It is inherent that a touch screen including an I/O controller for detecting a touch position on the touch screen. The combination of Richardson and Mital would provide a detachable and a writeable liquid crystal display.

As to claim 38, Richardson discloses the base station includes a processor (32, Fig. 7), a keyboard (16, Fig. 7) and a connection to a network (e.g. MODEM 50, Fig. 7).

4. Claims 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. (US Patent NO. 6,028,764) in view of Mital (US Patent No. 5,878,282) and Parrish (US Patent NO. 6,704,879).

As to claims 50, noted the discussion of claims 32, 39 and 43 above. It is noted that Richardson further discloses using either battery (capacitive storage element) which operates in lower power mode or AC power source operated in a higher power mode from the base computer but Richardson does not specifically disclose that the processor is operable at either a high frequency power mode or at a lower frequency power mode. Parrish is cited to teach the processor is operable at a high frequency power mode when it is connected to an AC power source and at a lower frequency power mode when it is used own DC power source (see col. 2, lines 27-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Richardson as modified with the features of the high or lower frequency operation as taught by Parrish because Farrish provide a method to reduce power consumption in a computer system (see col. 1, lines 36-37).

As to claim 51, Mital discloses the computing display subsystem comprising a non-volatile storage device (col. 6, line 35).

As to claim 52, it is well known in the art that the non-volatile storage device can be a flash memory.

As to claim 53, it would have been obvious to use the processor of the computing display subsystem is operable to operate using Intel Speedstep Technology because it was known in the art.

As to claim 54, Richardson discloses that the display could be a touch screen and Mital further discloses that the display is LCD display. It is inherent that a touch screen including an I/O controller for detecting a touch position on the touch screen. The combination of Richardson and Mital would provide a detachable and a writeable liquid crystal display.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/5/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 32-54, applicant argues that Richardson and Mital should not be combined because: (1) Richardson and Mital are from different fields or non-analogous arts; and (2) there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Richardson and Mital. These arguments are not persuasive because Richardson and Mital are clearly from the same fields such as they both are portable handheld computer. Secondly, Mital clearly suggests that a detachable display can have own processor and storage so as to operated independently after being removed from the main computer. Thus, Mital clearly suggest that sub-display system can be detached from the

main computer and operating independently by using it's own processor. It is believed that the broadly claimed structures are still met by the combination of the prior art references to Richardson and Mital.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to XIAO M. WU whose telephone number is 571-272-7761. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am to 4:00 pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2629

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

x.w.

September 16, 2006



XIAO M. WU
Primary Examiner (SPE)
Art Unit 2629